

REMARKS

Claims 1-95 are pending, with claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 36, 43, 50, 57, 64, 71, 78 and 85 being independent. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 25-29, 32, 34, 36, 39, 41, 43, 46, 48, 50, 53, 55, 57, 64, 71, 74, 78 and 81 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the application at, for example, pages 14-19 and, in particular, at page 14, lines 2-3; page 15, lines 21-22; page 16, lines 14-16; and page 17, line 25 to page 18, line 14. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 85-95 and the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 26 and 27 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Applicant also notes that Izawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,842,658), which is used as the basis of a rejection, does not appear to be listed on the form PTO-892 that accompanied the action or to otherwise be of record. As such, applicant asks that the Examiner provide a revised form PTO-892 that identifies Izawa.

Claims 1-4 and 7 have been rejected as being anticipated by Chow (U.S. Patent No. 6,872,322). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Chow does not describe or suggest cleaning a chamber, with the cleaning including placing a second substrate that is not to form a semiconductor device in the chamber, as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Chow teaches an arrangement in which the same substrate is in a chamber during etching and cleaning.

Applicant also requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Chow does not describe or suggest forming an insulating film over a semiconductor film formed over the first substrate, as also recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Chow describes, at Figs. 1A and 1B, and col. 2, lines 45-66, an arrangement including a silicon substrate 25 over which a silicon dioxide 26 is formed, and a gate electrode including a poly silicon layer 24 and a metal silicide 22 on and in contact with the poly silicon layer.

Claims 8-13, 22-25 and 28 have been rejected as being anticipated by Chow. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Chow, as discussed above, does not describe or suggest cleaning a chamber, with the cleaning including placing a dummy substrate in the chamber, as recited in amended claims 8 and 22.

Claims 15-19 and 21 have been rejected as being anticipated by Chow. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Chow, as discussed above, does not describe or suggest cleaning a chamber, with the cleaning including placing a second substrate that is not to form a semiconductor device in the chamber, or forming an insulating film over a semiconductor film formed over the first substrate, as recited in amended claim 15.

Claims 29-35 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Ye (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,400). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Chow, as discussed above, does not describe or suggest cleaning a chamber, with the cleaning including placing a second substrate that is not to form a semiconductor device in the chamber, as recited in amended claim 29, and because Ye, which is cited as showing the use of a chlorine containing gas to remove Box from the chamber surface, does not remedy this failure of Chow.

Claims 36-41 and 50-55 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu (U.S. Patent No. 6,352,081) in view of Izawa. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Lu, Izawa, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests cleaning a chamber, with the cleaning including placing a dummy substrate in the chamber, as recited in each of amended claims 36 and 50.

Claims 43-48 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Izawa. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Lu, Izawa, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests cleaning a chamber, with the cleaning including placing a second substrate that is not to form a semiconductor device in the chamber, as recited in amended claim 43.

Claims 57-61, 63-68 and 70 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Chow. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Lu,

Chow, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests manufacturing a first semiconductor device comprising performing a first plasma etching using a first etching gas in a chamber; cleaning the chamber, the cleaning including replacing the first etching gas with a cleaning gas; and manufacturing a second semiconductor device comprising performing a second plasma etching using a second etching gas in the chamber, as recited in each of amended claims 57 and 64.

Claims 71-84 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Izawa and Chow. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Lu, Izawa, Chow, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests manufacturing a first semiconductor device comprising performing a first plasma etching using a first etching gas in a chamber; cleaning the chamber, the cleaning including replacing the first etching gas with a cleaning gas; and manufacturing a second semiconductor device comprising performing a second plasma etching using a second etching gas in the chamber, as recited in each of amended claims 71 and 78.

Claims 6, 14 and 20, which depend, respectively, from claims 1, 8 and 15, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Chow in view of Ye. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Ye, as noted above, does not remedy the failure of Chow to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 8 and 15.

Claims 42, 49, 56, 62 and 69, which depend, respectively, from claims 36, 43, 50, 57 and 64, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Izawa and Ye. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Ye does not remedy the failure of Lu and Izawa to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 36, 43 and 50, or the failure of Lu and Chow to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 57 and 64.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Satoru Okamoto
Serial No. : 10/689,617
Filed : October 22, 2003
Page : 28 of 28

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-170001 / US6682

The fee in the amount of \$450 in payment of the two-month extension of time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

8/8/06



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331